

**REMARKS**

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed April 26, 2005. By the present amendment, the Applicants have canceled claims 1-8 and added new claims 18-22. In addition, the Applicants have amended the specification to correct a typographical error. It is respectfully submitted that the claims present in the application, namely claims 9-22, do not introduce new subject matter, are fully supported by the application, and are patentable over the prior art. Prompt and favorable consideration of these claims is earnestly sought.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,501,537 to Kohno (the '537 patent). According to the Office Action, the '537 patent discloses a printer including a rotatable take-up assembly, a rotatable supply assembly, a printhead assembly, a motor assembly, and a media sensing assembly. By the present amendment, the Applicants have canceled claims 1-8 and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the '537 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,412,991 to Klinefelter et al. (the '991 patent). According to the Office Action, the '537 patent discloses all of the claim limitations, but does not disclose that the sensor may be an infrared sensor. The Office Action asserted that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the infrared sensor disclosed in the '991 patent to the printer disclosed in the '537. By the present amendment, the Applicants have canceled claim 3 and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.


Appl. No. 10/668,943  
Amdt. dated July 5, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed April 26, 2005

The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 9-17 are allowable. Further still, the Office Action objected to claims 4 and 5 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the Applicants have rewritten canceled claim 4 as new claim 18 including the limitations of canceled claims 1 and 2. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 18-22 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the application, namely claims 9-22, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner desire a telephonic interview to resolve any outstanding matters, he is sincerely invited to contact the undersigned at (631) 501-5713.

Respectfully submitted,

Carter, DeLuca, Farrell & Schmidt, LLP  
445 Broad Hollow Road - Suite 225  
Melville, New York 11747  
Tel.: (631) 501-5713  
Fax: (631) 501-3526

  
Dana A. Brussel  
Reg. No. 45,717  
Attorney for Applicants